

Appl. No. 10/620,206  
Amdt. Dated April 3, 2007  
Reply to Office Action of January 4, 2007

Attorney Docket No. 81940.0054  
Customer No.: 26021

**Amendments to the Drawings:**

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to and replaces the original sheet including FIG. 4. In FIG. 4, step 421 has been amended to recite an uppercase P1.

Attachment:        Replacement Sheet  
                      Annotated Sheet Showing Changes

### **REMARKS**

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated January 4, 2007. Claims 1-20 remain in this application. Claims 1, 12, 13 and 16-20 are the independent Claims. Claims 5 and 6 have been amended. It is believed that no new matter is involved in the amendments or arguments presented herein. Reconsideration and entrance of the amendment in the application are respectfully requested.

### **Allowable Subject Matter**

On page 12 of the Office Action, Claims 6-8 and 10 were indicated to be allowable if re-written to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicant thanks the Examiner and formally recognizes the allowable subject matter of Claims 6-8 and 10.

### **Drawings**

Figure 4 discloses a minor typographical error. In response, Applicants have amended Figure 4 to correct the informality. Support for Figure 4 can be found in page 17, line 11 of Applicant's specification.

### **Claim Objections**

Claims 5 and 6 were objected to because of an informality. In response, Claims 5 and 6 have been amended. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the above objection are respectfully requested.

### **Art-Based Rejections**

Claims 1-5, 9 and 11-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over U.S. Patent Application No. 2001/0051996 (Cooper). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections and submit that the claims herein are patentable in light of the clarifying amendments above and the arguments below.

### **The Cooper Reference**

Cooper is directed to electronic media file content distribution. A consumer device and content materials found on a consumer device are authenticated by a content distribution system 200 using digital certificates (*See Cooper; Abstract, FIG. 3 and paragraphs [0065]-[0072]*).

### **The Claims are Patentable Over the Cited References**

The present application is generally directed to systems and methods for managing circulation passages of digital contents.

As defined by independent Claim 1, an apparatus that uses digital contents has a reception processing section that receives from a provider apparatus a certificate containing a first provider ID embedded therein by a certification authority, and a digital content having a second provider ID embedded therein by a contents guarantee authority. A first check processing section that judges by using the certificate as to whether or not the provider is authorized by the certification authority is provided. A storage processing section that reads the first provider ID from the certificate, correlates the first provider ID with the digital content, and store the digital content in a recording medium is provided. A detection processing section that detects the second provider ID from the digital content is provided. A second check processing section that compares the first provider ID and the second

provider ID to judge whether or not the first provider ID and the second provider ID match is provided. A use processing section that uses the digital content according to a decision made by the second check processing section is provided.

The applied references do not disclose or suggest the features of the present invention as defined by independent Claim 1. In particular, the applied references do not disclose or suggest, “a reception processing section that receives from a provider apparatus a certificate containing a first provider ID embedded therein by a certification authority, and a digital content having a second provider ID embedded therein by a contents guarantee authority,” as required by independent Claim 1.

Cooper is directed to receiving and authenticating user requests for content using digital certificates in response to content requests (*see Cooper; FIG. 3 and paragraph [0065]-[0069]*). In particular, Cooper defines a “consumer” and “user” as, “a person that seeks to transfer or download media content files, for example from a content provider or distributor.” (*see Cooper; paragraph [0037]*). Receiving a certificate from a content provider is not disclosed.

Furthermore, ferret programs search for and authenticate content found on consumer websites, FTP sites and databases (*see Cooper; paragraph [0072]*). In this manner, digital content is searched for and found by the content distribution system 200 on user devices 115. Cooper does not disclose receiving digital content from a provider apparatus.

In contrast, independent claim 1 requires an apparatus to receive a certificate and digital content from a provider apparatus. Cooper does not disclose or suggest authentication of a provider apparatus and receiving digital content from a provider apparatus.

Since the applied reference fails to disclose, teach or suggest the above features recited in independent Claim 1, that reference cannot be said to anticipate nor render obvious the invention which is the subject matter of that claim.

Accordingly, amended independent Claim 1 is believed to be in condition for allowance and such allowance is respectfully requested.

Applicant submits that independent Claims 12, 13 and 16-20 are allowable for at least the same reasons as discussed above with reference to independent Claim 1 and such allowance is respectfully requested.

The remaining claims depend either directly or indirectly from amended independent Claims 1, 12, 13, and 16-20 and recite additional features of the invention which are neither disclosed nor fairly suggested by the applied references and are therefore also believed to be in condition for allowance. For example, with respect to dependent claim 11, it is noted that this claim requires, "the storage medium stores a list of invalid certificates created by the certification authority." This requirement is nowhere taught or suggested by Cooper, and further distinguishes the present application over Cooper.

### Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application, as amended, are requested.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at the Los Angeles, California telephone number (310) 785-4721 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.


Appl. No. 10/620,206  
Amdt. Dated April 3, 2007  
Reply to Office Action of January 4, 2007

Attorney Docket No. 81940.0054  
Customer No.: 26021

If there are any fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-1314.

Respectfully submitted,  
HOGAN & HARTSON LLP.

Date: April 3, 2007

By   
Dariush G. Adli  
Registration No. 51,386  
Attorney for Applicant(s)

1999 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 1400  
Los Angeles, California 90067  
Phone: 310-785-4600  
Fax: 310-785-4601

Fig. 4

